

numerous cases in which the author has reduced the American shells to "varieties" of the European species, because in many of these cases there must long be great diversity of opinion, and for most purposes it matters little whether these closely related forms be called "varieties" or "species," so long as the actual differences are recognized. But since Mr. Jeffreys has evidently made so many important mistakes in his article in regard to the identity of species, and has united those that have no near affinities, as already shown, it is logical to conclude that he may have made other mistakes in the case of more critical species. He must therefore pardon us if we regard his decisions in all these cases as at least doubtful, until confirmed by other evidence.

XXIV.—*Remarks on Cervus chilensis and Cervus antisiensis.*

By P. L. SCLATER, M.A., F.R.S., Secretary to the Zoological Society of London.

I BEG leave to offer to the readers of the 'Annals' a few remarks upon the paper "On the Guémul (*Huamela leucotis*)" by Dr. Gray, which appeared in the number for December last (Ann. Nat. Hist. ser. 4, vol. x. p. 445). The acquisition of the male sex of the deer proposed by Dr. Gray to be called *Huamela leucotis* is of much interest. But Dr. Gray seems to have overlooked the fact that this deer had been named *Cervus chilensis* by Gay and Gervais in 1846 (Ann. des Sci. Nat. ser. 3, vol. v. p. 91), three years before he published a description of it as *Cervus leucotis* (P. Z. S. 1849, p. 64). Under these circumstances *Cervus chilensis* is the oldest name for this animal, under which name it has also been figured and described in Gay's 'Historia de Chile.' It may be objected that the name *chilensis* is inappropriate, as the animal is more particularly Patagonian than Chilian. But Dr. Philippi, as will be seen by reference to his remarks (Wieg. Arch. 1870, pt. i. p. 46), says that the Guémul, or *Cervus chilensis*, though now rare, is found in Chili, and gives notices of several places called after its name, from its having formerly occurred there.

As regards the allied species of deer of which Mr. Whitely has sent specimens from Tinta in Peru, and which Dr. Gray has called *Anomalocera huamel*, *Xenelaphus huamel*, and *Xenelaphus leucotis*, and now proposes to call *Xenelaphus anomalocera*, I may state that I have examined the specimens now in the British Museum, and have convinced myself that they are referable to *Cervus antisiensis* of D'Orbigny. Tschudi

(‘Fauna Peruana,’ Mamm. p. 241) has already recorded the existence of this deer in the Andes of Peru. The horns of the male specimen figured in P. Z. S. 1869, p. 497, are, in my opinion, monstrous or diseased; such distorted specimens are not unfrequently met with in several species of deer.

I am therefore of opinion that, although Dr. Gray is correct in distinguishing his so-called *Huamela leucotis* from his *Xenelaphus anomalocera*, the former (from Patagonia and Chili) should stand as *Cervus chilensis*, and the latter (from Peru and Bolivia) as *Cervus antisiensis*. If a generic or subgeneric name is required for these two closely allied species, *Furcifer* of Wagner (Säugeth. Suppl. vol. iv. p. 384, 1844) is the first given, and should be employed.

XXV.—*Further Remarks on the Guémul of Patagonia*
(*Huamela leucotis*). By Dr. J. E. GRAY, F.R.S. &c.

IN the ‘Annals’ for December 1872, p. 445, I gave an account of the skins of a male and female *Guémul* from Patagonia, presented by Don Enrique Simpson, and stated that it was the same animal that I had described and figured under the name of *Capreolus leucotis* (P. Z. S. 1849, p. 64, t. xii.), which Lord Derby had received from Patagonia.

Dr. Philippi, who lives at Santiago, says that the animal I figured as *C. leucotis* does not live in Chili, I suppose thereby meaning that it cannot be the *Guémul* of Molina; but Molina refers to the animal which Captain Wallis saw at the Magellan Straits, and Lord Derby’s specimen was received from Magellan Straits.

The Earl of Derby in 1840 received an imperfect skin of a female in thick winter fur from his brother-in-law Admiral Hornby, who obtained it on the coast of Chili; but no other particulars were to be obtained about it. I thought it probable that it was another specimen of *Capreolus leucotis* (Cat. Mamm., Ungulata, p. 227); but it shows so much more white on the abdomen and inner side of the legs, and appears to belong to a smaller animal, that I now think that it is probably a specimen of the same species that we received from Mr. Whitely, jun., from Tinta in the Peruvian Andes, or probably the winter coat of another species.

In 1869 we received a male, female, and fawn in summer fur of a deer, which were collected by Mr. Whitely, jun., at Tinta, in South Peru. As the skin of the male showed some thick dark fur like the female in Lord Derby’s collection,